



Executive Board

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

American Federation of Teachers

University of California, Santa Barbara Chapter, Local 2141

P. O. Box 15030 UCSB
Santa Barbara, CA 93107

UC-AFT-Santa Barbara
Newsletter, December 1978

Collective Bargaining--Regent Henning foresees new era at UC

The era of paternalism is over at the University of California, and the era of collective bargaining is here, according to Regent John Henning.

Speaking to an October 25 noontime audience of UCSB faculty and staff, Regent Henning traced the spectacular growth of public employee unions in recent years. He noted that AFT membership in California had increased over 600% in the years 1963-77.

Henning, executive secretary-treasurer of the California Labor Federation AFL-CIO, was recently appointed to the Board of Regents by Governor Brown. Henning's visit was sponsored by the campus chapters of UC-AFT and AFSME. In his address, he promised that the labor movement would provide strong support to organizational efforts on campus, now that the Berman bill (AB1091) authorizing collective bargaining for University employees, has become law. "The labor movement," he declared, "is strongly with you."

University Federation of Librarians

UC-AFT librarians from four campuses met at UCLA on October 28 to discuss the formation of the University Federation of Librarians. The idea for a federation was formulated at a recent statewide Executive Council meeting as a mechanism for creating a more distinct identity for librarians within the AFT organization. The Federation could eventually become a collective bargaining unit, but for now, as a result of the UCLA meeting, the federation will be an informal caucus. Contact people on each campus will be identified. Laura Nanna is serving as southern coordinator. The northern coordinator will be chosen at a meeting of UC-AFT librarians in the north on December 9th.

Questions about Collective Bargaining?

The November issue of the University Guardian includes a detailed analysis of collective bargaining and the Berman bill. For extra copies of this important issue, contact one of the following UC-AFT Executive Board members: Bob Potter, Dramatic Arts; Jacqueline Simons, French; Bernie Kirtman, Chemistry; Laura Nanna, Library.

PROMOTIONS AND MERIT RAISES --
NOT SO "NORMAL" AT UCSB

Nearly half of the UCSB faculty members considered for merit increases last year were denied these "normal" salary advances, according to statistics furnished by the Academic Senate's Committee on Academic Personnel. Of 216 faculty members considered for merit raises, 100 (or 46%) were not awarded them. This figure includes 47 deferred by their departments in the first place, and 53 others recommended by their departments, but ultimately turned down by the administration.

An even higher percentage -- fully 70% -- of those considered for promotion to Associate Professor or full Professor, were ultimately rejected. Of 82 faculty members up for such promotion, 44 were deferred by their departments, and an additional 13 were rejected in the reviewing process, for a total of 57.

There was a surprisingly close correlation (94.2%) between these final decisions of the administration and the recommendations of the faculty-appointed Committee at its September meeting, no explanations were offered for the high percentage of denials, but discussion centered on the widely-held belief that UCSB is far more restrictive in granting these advances than any other UC campus.

CAP Chairperson Robert Norris replied that comparative statistics were being assembled, and would be made available at a later date if faculty members requested them. UC-AFT chapter President Robert Potter indicated that he would make such a request, and move a reconsideration of the matter later in the year. A breakdown of the figures is given below:

1977-78 Personnel Actions at UCSB

Table 1. Merit Increases
(faculty considered = 216 or 44% of the ladder staff)

total # faculty considered for merit increase	Department recommends		CAP recommends		final administration action	
	Merit	Defer	Merit	defer or other	Merit	defer or other
216	169	47	110	59 + 47 106	116	53 + 47 100
% of those considered who were not recommended for merit increase		22%		49%		46%

Table 2. Promotions
(faculty considered = 82, or 17% of ladder staff)

total # faculty considered for promotion	Department recommends		CAP recommends		final administration action	
	Promote	defer or other	Promote	defer or other	Promote	defer or other
82	38	44	24	14 + 44 58	25	13 + 44 57
% of faculty consi- dered who were not recommended for promotion		54%		70%		70%